

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated October 30, 2000 (Paper No. 5). Claims 1 to 15 are in the application, of which Claims 1, 6, and 11 are the independent claims. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Initially, although the Office Action indicates that new drawings must be submitted, Applicants note that new formal drawings have been submitted with the Transmittal Of Formal Drawings dated May 17, 2004.

Claims 1 to 15 were rejected under the judicially-created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over Claims 1 to 3 of U.S. Patent No. 5,918,039 ("Buswell '039"). Withdrawal of the rejection and further examination are respectfully requested.

Referring to the rejection, the Office Action admits that the allegedly conflicting claims are not identical since the present invention includes the feature of simultaneously maintaining more than one connection between a terminal and a server. The Office Action further alleges that the feature of maintaining more than one connection between a terminal and a server equates to "multitasking," and is a feature considered inherent in a windowing environment.

As to the former contention that the allegedly conflicting claims are not identical, Applicants respectfully agree. Specifically, independent Claims 1 and 6 disclose the feature of a "means for simultaneously maintaining more than one connection between the terminal and server," and independent Claim 11 discloses the feature of a step for "simultaneously maintaining more than one connection between the terminal and server," while none of Claims 1 to 3 of Buswell '039 disclose such a feature.

As to the latter contention, that the above-referenced feature of the present invention equates to the multitasking feature allegedly inherent in the windowing environment, Applicants respectfully disagree. In particular, one of ordinary skill in the art would define the verb “multitask” as “[t]he ability to execute more than one *task* at the same time, a task being a program,” (*What is Multitasking? – A Word Definition From The Webopedia Computing Dictionary*, at <http://www.webopedia.com/TERM/m/multitasking.html> (last visited November 22, 2004) (emphasis in original)), or to “allow[] a user to perform more than one task (such as the operation of an application program) at a time” (WHATIS?COM’S ENCYCLOPEDIA OF TECHNOLOGY TERMS, (Que Publishing, 2002)). A “task” is further defined as “a basic unit of programming that an operating system controls,” where “[a]ll of today’s widely-used operating systems support **multitasking**, which allows multiple tasks to run concurrently, taking turns using the resources of the computer.” *Id* (emphasis in original).

Applicants respectfully assert that the act of “multitasking,” as is well known in the art, differs from the feature of maintaining more than one connection between the terminal and server. Specifically, and as described throughout the application including pages 21 to 23 of the specification, the present invention supports a *multisession* capability (as compared to *multitask* capability), where a user can switch between emulations, operating a Citrix connection in one window and a telnet connection in one window for example. Applicants assert that the multisession capability, or the capability to maintain more than one network connection at the same time, differs from a multitasking capability, which contemplates executing more than one program at the same time. For these and other reasons, Applicants further assert that the aforementioned feature of the invention, which was admitted by the Office Action not to be

disclosed in the applied reference, is not anticipated by nor is it an inherent feature of a windowing environment.

In this case, Applicants submit that Claims 1 to 3 of Buswell '039 fail to describe, either expressly or inherently, the capability of simultaneously maintaining more than one connections between the terminal and server, as described in independent Claims 1, 6 and 11, and Applicants submit that one skilled in the art would find nothing inherently described in Claims 1 to 3 of Buswell '039 that suggests or describes such a capability. If the Examiner believes there is any support for such inherent description in Claims 1 to 3 of Buswell '039, or in any other reference, that would suggest such description to a person of ordinary skill in the art, Applicants invite the Examiner to provide a specific reference for such support. M.P.E.P. § 2131.01 (III).


Accordingly, independent Claims 1, 6 and 11 are believed to be in condition for allowance. The other rejected claims in the application are each dependent from the independent claims and are believed to be allowable over the applied reference for at least the same reasons. Because each dependent claim is deemed to define additional aspects of the invention, however, the individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that the entire application is in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Orange County office by telephone at (949) 851-0633. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address given below.

Respectfully submitted,

MCDERMOTT, WILL & EMERY


Dennis A. Duchene
Registration No. 40,595

18191 Von Karman Ave., Suite 400
Irvine, CA 92612-0187
(949) 851-0633 DAD:wj
Facsimile: (949) 851-9348
Date: November 22, 2004